that you can't do an upgrade or a modernize or
replace.
MR. LANGLEY: We are negotiating as
recently as this morning before the hearing. We are
negotiating that.
ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Does it look
like you're getting there?
MR. LANGLEY: I think we're making
progress. We owe them a response to their responses
to our responses to their first proposal.
MR. SEIVER: I'm not sure where we are in
that process, but I do think it's the ball is in
your court.
MR. LANGLEY: That is true. I believe
that is true.
MR. SEIVER: And your honor, the
discussions today, I think, have helped inform us
even more as to the scope of a stipulation. And in
fact, I don't know if this is possible. I'm just
going to suggest it now. I could almost see that we
could probably stipulate almost to every relevant
fact that would have to be proved by a fact witness

(202) 234-4433

and reduce it purely to expert and legal testimony about what the APCO standard means when it says loss to the owner versus value to the taker, because our position is going to be that a lot of what Gulf Power talks about is some value to the cable operator as opposed to something that they're really out -ofpocket. If we could nail down on what the cost issues are, we might be able to even have this really be some valuation experts and maybe one or two engineering experts and then, your honor, it would be the briefing as to well, does replacement cost methodology satisfy the standard, or does the cable rate formula. You know, things like that.

MR. LANGLEY: That might be a possibility, although I was really looking forward to a trial getting the costs of --

ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, now let me -obviously, I'm -- what you're saying to me is very
positive, but very po ssible, but as I have been
looking upon this and getting this case ready for
trial, has been in effect getting the deck of cards
that the experts can look at to testify to and say,

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

well, yes, that's reliable numbers because of this, 1 that, and the other thing, and here's where we go 2 with those numbers. And I've been feeling frustrated 3 because somehow or other, we just can't get to that 4 point where there's going to be the solid record that 5 both experts are going to look at the say, here's 6 where I go on that, and here's where I go on that. 7 This seems to be worthwhile this morning, because we 8 seem to be getting closer and closer and closer to 9 what those experts are going to -- what the universe 10 is that both experts are going to get. 11 The only 12 reason that we have to get into discovery on nitty -13 gritty records like make-ready and whatnot is because you can't agree as to the reliability of numbers. 14 And if you can, you know, within a framework, if you 15 can agree to reliability, then we can move on. 16 Unless I'm missing some point. 17

MR. SEIVER: No, your honor. And just as a follow-up on that, one of the issues that we've been talking about today is, and which we will get to is, for example, on the Osmose report, we don't have anything other than this statement of, and I forget -

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

18

19

20

21

1		
2		
3	-	
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		

22

- forgive me if I'm wrong, I think it's 7,823 poles out of the 9,000 that were examined, we don't have anything to show which pole, who's on it, you know, what are the parameters, why it's full, and we've been talking about when we're going to get that kind of information. And although we are convinced, and I think that it would be legal error not to go on a pole-by-pole basis to make a determination as to a full pole, our experts, if we're doing our summaries tomorrow, will not have seen, except for the statement of work, will not have seen anything that says, okay, pole at the corner of, you know, I'll make up Palifax and Chase -- I don't know -- I used that the other -- Palifax and Chase, on the northeast corner, is a full pole and look at i t and have our experts say, yes, it is, or no, it isn't. We don't have that. And I'm not sure -- I know I'm jumping ahead, but this is your honor's concern about getting this thing ready for hearing an getting this we're going to do a pole -by-pole basis, I don't know if Mr. Langley intends to put in 7,823 proffers on individual poles, which then we would say, yes or no

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

to it, and which your honor would have to say, yes, I 2 agree, or no, I disagree. That concerns me. 3 ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I don't think 4 that -- I'm not going to put -- hold Mr. Langley's 5 feet to the fire on that one just yet. I mean we this is -- I've been constantly going back to this 6 7 again and again and again. They've got the burden of proceeding and the burden of proof. If they fail, 8 then they fail. If they make it, they make it. And 9 how he does it, you know, there's all kinds of 10 imaginative ways to try cases like this, and I have 11 to wait until he's ready to do it. Now, I'm not 12 trying to undercut your discovery becaus e of that. 13 And this is why I think I've been very -- you know, 14 you've gotten a lot of discovery. 15 MR. SEIVER: We have. 16 ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: And you know, maybe 17 it's getting into areas that we don't need that much 18 discovery on. That's what I'm hearing this morning. 19 20 MR. COOK: Although, you're honor, just 21 22 seconding my colleague's comment. For example, you

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	even ,to help the process along, directed Gulf Power
2	to file a three -pole-proffer as to full capacity.
3	Here we are, approximately three and a h alf weeks
4	away from what you'd said in the end of March or
5	early April as the close of discovery. Even that
6	proffer doesn't tell us where those poles are so we
7	can send our experts out to look at them. So we'll
8	come to this later, and I don't want to interrupt the
9	flow of the discovery order, but it is central to
10	everything we do including remaining depositions that
11	we need to talk about that we get a chance to have
12	identified to us specific poles that they're going to
13	say are at full capacity. Otherwise, discovery
14	closes. We have had no chance for the experts to say
15	and no chance for us to go out and see which poles
16	they're going to rely on. And I would add one last
17	sentence, which is Mr. Langley said a moment ago, you
18	know, hey wait, that's not fair. You saw on the
19	description of evidence back in 2004 that make -ready
20	was an issue. But as to specific poles, it all comes
21	down to that, even if they take the position now
22	three quarters of our poles are at full capacity, any

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 pole that you're on, complainants, that has had make-2 ready done while you've been attached is a pole at 3 full capacity. We still have to say which are those 4 poles. Identify them. 5 ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I think I've 6 been very specific in my directions on those things 7 in terms of requiring them, I mean even to the point of requiring them to go I think beyond perhaps what 8 Rule 34 requires and have them identify the poles 9 that are already on existing maps. So, you know, I'm 10 not discarding at all your point. I'm not putting 11 that aside at all. I'm just simply trying to go down 12 these outstanding discovery requests one -by-one and 13 find out what's going on and what can we do to move 14 the process along. 15 Sounds right. MR. COOK: 16 ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: We'll get to 17 Osmose. 18 MR. LANGLEY: Your honor, may I. 19 ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes. 20 Go ahead. 21 I'm sorry. MR. LANGLEY: I wanted to address the 22

# NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

proffer, the three —pole-proffer of the Osmose evidence. It did not have a street address, but it did have a GPS locator that I believe is a —ccurate within — is it three feet or ten feet — three feet, so I mean there's very specific location data that was submitted without proffer. And with the Knology make-ready work order packet that we submitted, the specific poles identified do in fact have street addresses on them. Let me see if I can find that. For example, I'm looking at K —42, page 23, of the evidentiary proffer, and it identifies the map as 40—45 and the address as 1801 Georgia Court. So, I mean I believe the evidence that we submi —tted with our proffer is pretty specific.

ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Is there any problem. Again, that proffer was required -- so -- as an idea -- so that -- certainly so that I could understand what it is in a tangible way what you're talking about. But if you wanted to check out -- do you have enough information to check out what's in that proffer?

MR. COOK: Your honor, responding to that

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

Τ	specific point with respect to the three poles which
2	was your honor's order, show us three poles that are
3	at full ca pacity, I looked at those pages, and
4	there's computerized data, but we haven't been given
5	the backup to show how to interpret that to tie it
6	into a location to go look at it. With respect to
7	the Knology materials that he included, that was
8	material you did not call for that he added on, and
9	at that time, we did not understand them to be saying
10	all of these are at full capacity.
11	MR. LANGLEY: I believe we said that in
12	our proffer, and I don't think your honor's order
13	limited us to three poles from the Osm ose report. I
14	understood that to be
15	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: No. No. Go ahead.
16	Go ahead. I'm sorry.
17	MR. LANGLEY: I didn't mean to interrupt
18	you, your honor.
19	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: No. But I'm not
20	saying no that it was you're wrong. I'm saying, no,
21	you're right. I was not limiting it to Osmose poles.
22	Go ahead.

## NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

MR. LANGLEY: We understood your order to say, hey, give me a sampling of how you're going to prove crowding. And so for the -- to round out the picture, we include the Knology make-ready work order packet and explained how we contend that shows crowding on a pole-by-pole basis. ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you know, I -- Mr. Cook, I mean --MR. COOK: That's news to us, your honor. ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, this is why, you know, you should be talking about this away from I mean this is, you know, you get something in me. the mail, you don't understand it, you pick up the

MR. COOK: Well, I think the thing is that that I believe came in on October 17th, and the final report with Osmose was due less than two weeks later or two weeks later on Halloween, and we were expecting in the final Osmose report to get a listing

phone, and you call your counterpart, and you say

doing that with you today.

what's going on here, and, you know, they explain it

to you. I mean I don't know why I should have to be

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and identification of the specific poles, using your honor's own phrasing, pin down one-by-one that are at full capacity. And instead, we got four pages of which -- all we got was 9,66 3 poles. They're mostly from one area, Pensacola served by Cox. You know, we might survey some others. But there's no backup for this, no identification, no pinning down one -by-one of which poles are at full capacity. But we are jumping ahead here.

about the Osmose report now?

MR. COOK: Right.

ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Well, we're not on that yet. You know, we're not on that yet. I'm trying to address the concerns that you raise with respect to the sample pole that they submitted. All right. Well, I'm going to just pass off of that. I told you what my purpose for requiring that was, and to the extent that purpose has been met, it's fine. If you all want to, you know, use that as a basis to negotiate what kind of evidence you think that the record is going to need,

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

that's fine too. But I again go back to what I've been saying. They've got the burden of proof. The only thing that I'm requiring them to do is to give you sufficient advance notice of what proof they're going to put in so that you can be ready for purposes of cross examining or in any other way of undercutting the validity of their factual basis for their arguments. And to the extent that you need to put on positive evidence yourself, which I would expect would be primarily through experts, because you don't really have a burden of proving anything. So, you know, let them do their thing. Let the Gulf Power do its thing, and, you know, I just want to be sure that you're not surprised by anything.

MR. COOK: Right. And I think, this is my final comment on this point, is that all of our questions in discovery have been motivated by trying to say tell us before the hearing, Gulf Power, which poles you're going to come forward with. And they -- now that we understand they're taking the position all poles that have make -ready including 14,000 for Knology as a blanket assertion, we might be able to

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

go and pick out poles to challenge some of their 1 2 assertions. But --ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, let's just --3 let them take it one step at a time. MR. COOK: Right. Okay. 5 ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Now I think that 6 7 request number 12 would be then next one. The -- oh, yes, an unregulated marker for pole space. 8 9 MR. COOK: Yes, your honor, and with 10 respect to this, there are really two points. Your honor had said in the second discovery order, I 11 believe it was provide some more identification on 12 this point, and there were two issues --13 I didn't mean to cut MR. LANGLEY: No. 14 you off, but we're going to do this. We're going to 15 actually give them the specific Bates labels of the 16 documents that --17 MR. COOK: But there's an important 18 clarification here, which is your supplemental 19 responses identify two categories of unregulated 20 market documents. One was within Bates range, 21 forgive me your honor, it's approximately 800 to 22

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 2,400 or something.

ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: It's over 1,400 documents.

MR. COOK: Right. You directed them, within that range -- now I remember, it's 1,483 documents -- te ll us which of those are the unregulated market, but I don't want the court here to lose sight of the second category in their supplemental responses. There was a reference to certain other documents available in our files. And it's that also that we want to have produced and not see it the first time in the pre -- file direct testimony.

MR. LANGLEY: I guess I do need to address the second part of that. The documents -- the other documents, I think, were largely duplicative, but to insure that we had pro duced everything, those were made available at the corporate headquarters when John and Rita Tewari came down to Gulf Power. John, you can tell me if I'm wrong. I though you all had actually reviewed those documents.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	MR. SEIVER: We did review documents, but
2	I don't know, unless I pick them up one at a time and
3	show them to somebody to say is this what you're
4	relying on as evidence of unregulated market or not?
5	I don't know.
6	MR. LANGLEY: Well, it's not as difficult
7	as they're making it sound. The d ocuments we're
8	relying on as evidence of the unregulated market are
9	the agreements where people are paying an unregulated
10	rate and are joint use agreements and the billing for
11	those respective agreements. It's going to be a
12	discrete amount of documents that we contend support
13	the unregulated market. It's really o
14	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, how long
15	are you going how long is it going to take you to
16	identify those documents for them?
17	MR. LANGLEY: I think your honor set a
18	deadline for December 9th. And we
19	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. And you're
20	going to meet that?
21	MR. LANGLEY: Absolutely.
22	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. So
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	there. I think you have your answer. All right.
2	You're going to get the documents within the
3	the 1,483 Bates numbered documents. And then you're
4	going to get identification of agreements and the
5	other documents that Mr. Langley referred to for the
6	other documents. So I'm going to rely on that being
7	done. What date did I give you on that? December
8	9th.
9	MR. LANGLEY: December 9th.
LO	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Request
11	number 15 was specify full capacity on the pole maps
L2	that were pre -Osmose, full capacity, due December
13	9th. That's the over and above task that I assigned
L4	to you, and that's being done also. Is that correct?
L5	MR. LANGLEY: Yes, your honor.
L6	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. So, Mr.
L7	Seiver or Mr. Cook, you, you know, when you receive
18	that, then you'll know what you're getting.
19	MR. COOK: Okay. Could I ask for one
20	clarification on that point?
21	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Sure.
22	MR. COOK: When we issued that request,

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

**NEAL R. GROSS** 

if you look back to the language of our request, we said look at the maps and things created before the Osmose report up to February 2005. I believe your honor expanded on that to say all of the maps and materials that identify poles at full capacity and taking us right up to the present. And I was wondering if we would see all of that on December 9th.

ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Not all of the

Osmose maps. This is all the maps that they -- I

thought at somewhere along the line I had met that -
narrowed that specification as that's what I assumed

was being asked for. You got Osmose's in category

one, but that's coming.

MR. COOK: Okay.

ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: And you got all these other maps that they had previously prepared for whatever reason, but these are maps that identify pole locations. So, you know, my logical type of question to myself was well, why can't we use that as a starting base or a comparative base by having the identify which of those are at full capacity. And

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

then, you know, this is where we are today. 2 that's going to be done by December 9th, correct? 3 MR. LANGLEY: Correct. 4 ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: And it's -- let us be clear that that will not include the Osmose maps, 5 6 any Osmose maps that they have created, or are you will to go beyond and do that, too? 7 MR. LANGLEY: We actually are willing to 8 go beyond, but part of it is for a matter of 9 efficiency. The way the Osmose survey has worked is 10 they have loaded into their system these geospatial 11 maps, and then they can overlay their data on those 12 maps. So the ones that we give them on the 9th will 13 actually be map-size paper that has -- you'll be able 14 to see streets and there will be dots where we have 15 crowded -- not crowded, on the actual map. 16 ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. That's 17 very good. 18 MR. SEIVER: And just so I know, will 19 20 there be an explanation of who's on the pole and what 21 parameter led to your conclusion that it's crowded or 22 not crowded?

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	MR. LANGLEY: That is the data that we
2	are working to give you in electronic format so that
3	you will be able to actually go to a specific pole
4	and then see all of the engineering data that Osmose
5	has collected. I can't guarantee that that will be
6	on the 9th, but I'm hopeful that it will be.
7	MR. COOK: I think, your honor, a few
8	issues down the road, that raises the question of
9	schedule and when we would whether we would see
10	that before a deposition of Osmose.
11	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Cook, you' re
12	always three steps ahead of me.
13	MR. COOK: Okay. Sorry, your honor.
14	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: We'll get to that.
15	All right. That takes me through the status of the
16	document request I believe.
17	MR. SEIVER: Yes, your honor.
18	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Did I miss
19	anything?
20	MR. SEIVER: No. We're up to the
21	interrogatories.
22	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Now
İ	NEAL P. CDOSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	before I move on, though, let me as the Bureau. Is
2	there anything in terms of all of this back and
3	forth, is there anything that the Bureau wi shes to
4	interject in terms of information that the Bureau
5	would be expecting to see? Just how much do you want
6	to participate in this? Obviously you're
7	participating. I didn't mean to put it that way, but
8	if you
9	MR. LIEN: We don't have anything to
10	interject, your honor.
11	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you. Let's
12	start with the interrogatories, then. Interrogatory
13	number eight, include poles that are having
14	noncompliant attached, in other words, yes, poles
15	that have attachments that are not complaina nt's
16	attachments. The answer is okay. It seems to me the
17	answer is okay, but can you just explain expand a
18	little bit on that, Mr. Langley.
19	MR. LANGLEY: Your honor, may I have a
20	moment to pull this response up so I can
21	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes. Go ahead.
22	I've got interrogatory 8, 20, 34, 35, and 46. I'm

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

reading in my note. My note says to me that the answer you gave seems to be okay, but I'm looking for a little bit more discussion and explanation.

MR. LANGLEY: Your honor, what we tried to do here was to lay out the process of comparing the documents, because it became apparent to me that they actually did not understand how to -- how a permit relates to a distribution service order and what information is revealed in the distribution service order. I erroneously assumed that the operators new how that worked. But I take them on their word that they don't. And so what we've done here is lay that out on a step-by-step basis. are looking for a particular pole, you go to the permit number which includes the pole. The permit number refers you to a distribution service order, and they have these permits. And then the distribution service orders are actually pretty easy to find if you know what you're looking for. And so what we endeavored to do here is to say this is how you find out what you're looking for. It's really pretty -- I'm sorry --

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: That's okay. And then those records are in some kind of folder files that are easily retrievable?

MR. LANGLEY: They are, and all of this,

the make -ready process is managed at a very local level, and Gulf Power service territory runs from the Florida-Alabama border over by Pensacola east over to Panama City, so we're talking about a fairly limited geographical scope. It does not extend through the better part of Florida. And there are, Ralph, 11 or 12 engineering and construction offices? I think 11 or 12 where all this make -ready is done. So for example, let's take Cox Communications, for example, the engineering and construction offices to which Cox would submit a permit request and through which make ready work orders would have been prepared, are all in the Pensacola area. And you can even get further detail based on where in Pensacola, because there's, I believe, four or five engineering construction offices within Pensacola. And so if they knew that they wanted to look at Pace and what was it, Palafox and Chase? If they wanted to look at that pole that

John referred to on the corner of Palafox and Chase, they would know what office they would have gone to to submit their permit application, and that would be the office where the actual make -ready file is kept.

And then you look at the numbers. You'd see distribution service order 123. You'd go to that one, and you'd pull it out.

ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: But I heard you say something that depending on how finite the information is, it might -- some of the information might be stored and kept in other offices.

MR. LANGLEY: That's true. For example,
Comcast. They don't operate in Pensacola. They
operate, I believe, principally in the Panama City
area. And then northward into Bay County. So all of
their permit applications and, incidentally, all of
their -- the make -ready orders prepared pursuant to
those requests would be kept in either the Panama
City Beach office or the Panama City office depending
where in Comcast territory the make -ready project
occurred. But they would know. I mean because they,
Comcast, would physically, someone would either call

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 their local guy at the engineering and construction office and say, hey, I need, yes, I want a permit, 50 2 new attachments, and so they know what office to 3 call. 4 5 MR. COOK: May I respond at the 6 appropriate time.

> ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: No. I just want to ask one more -- I'm trying to get a clarification If they asked for all the -- I don't know if I'm trying to listen to myself -- but all of these records that you're referring to from Comcast, would it be -- I mean if they asked that up front, cou 1d those records made available in one place for them to come and look at, or were they going to have to go to one, two, or three offices to get them, the full picture

> MR. LANGLEY: For Comcast, it would probably be two offices, because there's a beach office, and I may be wrong about this. They may all be kept in the actual Panama City office. There's two offices in that area, Panama City and Panama City Beach. So it could be two offices --

## **NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS** 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: It seems to me that
2	if the complainan ts don't let you go forward with
3	that process, that you're going to have to make all
4	the records that they ask for to look at available in
5	one place. I think that's unreasonable to ask them
6	to jump around from office to office.
7	MR. LANGLEY: You're referring to per
8	complainant?
9	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, at least per
10	complainant. Now we're talking about the difference
11	between you're looking at obviously I can
12	understand wanting to see the complainant records
13	MR. COOK: And that's an import ant point
14	of clarification, because this request goes to
15	attachments involving parties other than
16	complainants.
17	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: I understand that.
18	That's my point. That's my point. That could be a
19	lot more I mean how many parties are we talking
20	about, non-complainant parties are we talking about?
21	Do you know?
22	MR. LANGLEY: I do. We've actually

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433